

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ERIC TRAVIS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMERIHOM MORTGAGE COMPANY
LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-01267-KES-SAB

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT
BE IMPOSED FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR
AT SCHEDULING CONFERENCE

THREE DAY DEADLINE

A scheduling conference in this action was set for October 3, 2024 at 10:00 a.m., before the undersigned. (ECF No. 18.) No counsel for Plaintiff appeared at the scheduling conference.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000).

Plaintiff shall be required to show cause why sanctions should not issue for the failure by counsel to make any appearance at the scheduling conference held on October 3, 2024.

///

///

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within **three (3) days** from the date of entry of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why sanctions should not be imposed for the failure of counsel to attend the mandatory scheduling conference held on October 3, 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 3, 2024**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE